

**REMARKS**

Claims 21-24, 28-32, 34 and 35 are pending in the application.

Claims 21-24, 28-32, 34 and 35 have been rejected.

Claims 21, 22 and 28 are amended.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview of May 8, 2009.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 28-32 and 34-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for reciting computer systems as elements of a method. Applicants have amended Claim 28 to remove the recitation of computer systems. Applicants believe that this amendment adds no new matter. Applicants believe that this amendment addresses the concern expressed by the Examiner.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 21-24, 28, 31, 32, 34 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bayeh *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6633914 B1, 10/14/2003 (*Bayeh-914*), in view of in view of Bayeh *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6012098 A, 01/04/2000 (*Bayeh-098*) and further in view of “Press return = Click Button?” (8/1/1997) by Michael Cote (*Cote*). In light of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner’s reconsideration and re-examination of all pending claims.

Applicants have amended independent claims 21 and 28 to recite limitations that are not taught or fairly suggested in the sections of *Bayeh-914*, *Bayeh-098*, and *Cote* that are cited in the Final Office Action. In particular, as discussed with the Examiner in the May 8 telephonic interview, independent Claim 21 has been amended to recite that “wherein the object manager is

configured to forward the first and second results to the first and second computers, respectively, via the first and second session based network connections, respectively, in a compressed format.” Similarly, independent claim 28 now recites “transmitting the first and second data in a compressed format.” Example support for these newly added limitations can be found in the present Specification on page 20, line 16. Further, dependent Claim 22 now recites, “the object manager is configured to maintain a state of the first client and a state of the second client.” Example support for this newly added limitation can be found in the specification on page 20, line 13.

Because, as discussed with the Examiner, the newly added limitations are not taught or fairly suggested in the sections of pages cited in the Office Action, either alone or in combination with the remaining limitations claims 21 and 28, Applicants assert these independent claims are patentably distinguishable. The remaining claims depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 21 and 28 and are patentably distinguishable for this reason.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants submit that all claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. Applicant also hereby authorizes that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to deposit account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen A. Mason  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 64,303  
Telephone: (512) 439-5098  
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099